WILLIAMS CUKER BEREZOFSKY

Woodland Falls Corporate Center 210 Lake Drive East, Suite 101 Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002 (856) 667-0500

FILED

JUN 26 2009

Judge Jamie D. Happas

WATTS GUERRA CRAFT LLP

555 North Carancahua Tower II, 14th Floor Corpus Christi, Texas 78478 (361) 887-0500

Attorneys for Plaintiff.

VINES GUILLORY,

Plaintiff,

ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION **MIDDLESEX COUNTY**

Docket No. MID-L-002691 MT

v.

CIVIL ACTION

INC.; JOHNSON & JOHNSON; JOHNSON & IN RE ORTHO EVRA BIRTH CONTROL JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. f/k/a R.W. JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, JANE DOE DISTRIBUTORS (1-50); JILL DOE MANUFACTURERS (1-50); JACK DOE WHOLESALERS (1-50); JAKE DOE SELLERS (1-50); JOHN DOE MARKETERS (1-50); JOAN DOE FORMULATORS (1-50); JIM DOE HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS (1-

PATCH LITIGATION

CASE CODE: 275

ORDER

Defendants.

50); and JEAN DOE (1-50),

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court by application of Esther Berezofsky,

Esquire, attorney for Plaintiff, for an Order granting leave for Williams Cuker Berezofsky;

Watts Guerra Craft LLP and Terry Bryant to withdraw as counsel for the plaintiff, and the Court
having considered the moving papers, and any opposition thereto, and for good cause having
been shown,
IT IS, on this 26th day of June, 2009,
ORDERED that the motion for leave for Williams Cuker Berezofsky; Watts Guerra
Craft LLP and Terry Bryant to withdraw as counsel for the plaintiff in the within action be and is
hereby GRANTED; and
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all proceedings including discovery, in this matter shall be stayed pending substitution of counsel, but in no event more than days of the date of this Order; and
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the within Order shall be served on all
counsel and plaintiff within days of the date of this Order.
J.S.C.
Papers Considered:
 Notice of Motion Movant's Affidavits Movant's Brief Answering Affidavits Answering Brief Cross-Motion Movant's Reply Other Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R.1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.